arXiv:1511.01061v1 [cs.DS] 2 Nov 2015

A correction on Shiloach's algorithm for minimum linear arrangement of trees

J. L. Esteban[1] and R. Ferrer-i-Cancho[2]

[1] Logic and Programming, LOGPROG Research Group, Departament de Ciències de la Computació, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Campus Nord, Edifici Omega. Jordi Girona Salgado 1-3. 08034 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

[2] Complexity & Qualitative Linguistics Lab, LARCA Research Group, Departament de Ciències de la Computació, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Campus Nord, Edifici Omega. Jordi Girona Salgado 1-3. 08034 Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

Abstract

More than 30 years ago, Shiloach published an algorithm to solve the minimum linear arrangement problem for undirected trees. Here we fix a small error in the original version of the algorithm.

More than 30 years ago, Shiloach published an $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.2})$ algorithm to solve the minimum linear arrangement problem for undirected trees [1]. The idea of the algorithm was used by Chung to produce a subquadratic algorithm [2]. At the bottom of p. 18, Shiloach defines

$$S_0 = ... + p_0(n_* + 1) \quad (1)$$

$$S_1 = ... + p_1(n_* + 1) - 1. \quad (2)$$

An accurate derivation of S_0 and S_1 (see below) indicates that these definitions should read as

$$S_0 = ... + p_0(n_* + n_0 + 1) \quad (3)$$

$$S_1 = ... + p_1(n_* + n_0 + 1) - 1. \quad (4)$$

This little mistake implies that part b) of Theorem 3.1.2 is wrong. The error concerns steps 6-7 of Shiloach's algorithm (Section 3.2 of his article, pp. 19-20). Shiloach omitted the proof of that theorem arguing that it "is by a straightforward calculation which follows from elementary definitions" (pp. 19).

We discovered this mistake trying to understand why our implementation of Shiloach's algorithm failed for complete binary trees of k levels with $k \geq 5$. For trees with $k \geq 1$, the solution of the m.l.a. is [3]

$$D_{min} = 2^k \left(\frac{k}{3} + \frac{5}{18} \right) + (-1)^k \frac{2}{9} - 2. \tag{5}$$

For $k = 5$, Eq. 5 gives $D_{min} = 60$ while our original implementation of Shiloach's algorithm gave $D_{min} = 46$. Once we corrected the definitions of S_0 and S_1, our implementation of Shiloach's algorithm ceased to give wrong results.

To understand the little errors in the definitions of S_0 and S_1, notice that a type B arrangement of a tree $T(\alpha)$ depends on a certain calculated parameter p_α (where α is either 0 or 1), and consists of placing the tree $T_* = T(\alpha) - (T_1, ..., T_{2p_\alpha - \alpha})$ at the center surrounded by subtrees $T_1, ..., T_i, ..., T_{2p_\alpha - \alpha}$ as indicated in Figs. 4(a) and 4(b) of Shiloach's article. $\alpha = 0$ indicates that the tree T is a free tree (Fig. 4(a)) and $\alpha = 1$ indicates that T is an anchored tree (Fig. 4(b)). Part b) of Theorem 3.1.2 defines the cost of an arrangement of type B for a tree T as

$$C_\alpha = C[\pi, T(\alpha)] = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \text{ is odd}}}^{2p_\alpha - 1} C[\pi_i, \overrightarrow{T}(v_i)] + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \text{ is even}}}^{2p_\alpha - 2\alpha} C[\pi_i, \overleftarrow{T_i}(v_i)] + C[\pi_*, T_*] + S_\alpha, \tag{6}$$

The couple of summations in Eq. 6 comprise the cost of the anchors of every anchored subtree T_i but the edge joining any T_i to T_* is longer that the anchor of T_i. S_α is added to account for the missing part of the cost, which in case that $\alpha = 1$ also has to account for the cost of the anchor of T. When $\alpha = 0$, T_* has p_0 subtrees to its left and p_0 subtrees to its right. In contrast, when $\alpha = 1$, T_* has p_1 subtrees to its left and $p_1 - 1$ subtrees to its right. With this background in mind, a derivation of S_0 and S_1 is straightforward.

With the help of Fig. 4(a) and the definition of C_α, one obtains

$$S_0 = (n_3 + n_4) + 2(n_5 + n_6) + (p_0 - 1)(n_{2p_0 - 1} + n_{2p_0}) + p_0(Z + 1), \tag{7}$$

where Z is the number of vertices of the tree T_*. If $Z = n_*$ we get exactly Shiloach's definition of S_0. The problem is that (a) the tree T has been decomposed into the subtrees $T_0, T_1, ..., T_i, ..., T_{2p_\alpha - \alpha}$ and theorem 3.1. (p. 18) defines n_* as

$$n_* = n - \sum_{i=0} n_i, \tag{8}$$

where n_i is the size of the i-th subtree. Thus T_* includes T_0 and then $Z = n_* + n_0$. Recalling that S_1 comprises the length of the anchor of $T(\alpha)$, Fig. 4(b) helps one to see that

$$S_1 = (n_2 + n_3) + 2(n_4 + n_5) + (p_1 - 1)(n_{2p_1 - 2} + n_{2p_1 - 1}) + p_1(Z + 1) - 1. \tag{9}$$

where $Z = n_* + n_0$ again.

Alternatively, the error could be in Shiloach's definition of n_* (recall Eq. 8), which should be replaced by

$$n_* = n - \sum_{i=1} n_i. \tag{10}$$

If that was the case, Theorem 3.1.2 would be correct but then Theorem 3.1.1, where n_* is defined, could be wrong. We discarded this alternative because our implementation with the new definition of n_* (Eq. 8) fails with other kinds of trees.

Finally, we note that the version of Eq. 6 in Shiloach's article (middle of p. 19) has a couple of typos: $C[\pi, \overrightarrow{T_i}(v_i)]$ should read $C[\pi_i, \overrightarrow{T_i}(v_i)]$ and $C[\pi, T_*]$ should read $C[\pi_*, T_*]$.

References

[1] Y. Shiloach. A minimum linear arrangement algorithm for undirected trees. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 8(1):15–32, 1979.

[2] F. R. K. Chung. On optimal linear arrangements of trees. *Comp. & Maths. with Appls.*, 10(1):43–60, 1984.

[3] F. R. K. Chung. A conjectured minimum valuation tree. *SIAM Review*, 20:601–604, 1978.